



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

vowel, in the same way as in *sâr*. But why is it that the manuscript has always *dâr* and on the other hand constantly *saar*? The latter agrees with the general custom of the MS., according to which the long vowel of a monosyllabic word is marked by doubling the vowel or by a stroke above, e. g., *gaat*, *see*, *miin*, *lôs*, *hûs*. This rule does not apply to the open long *e*-sound before *r*, which is given by *æ* or *ae*. Otherwise it is so strictly adhered to, that special reasons may be supposed to exist for the exceptions. This is the case with *uuez* 20, 2, *forlez* 12, 8 and *her* 35, 20, 27, where the regular Rhine-Frankish forms are *uueiz*, *forleaz* and *hear*. The form *uuez* seems due simply to incorrect spelling (cf. BRAUNE, 'Ahd. Gr.'<sup>2</sup> §44, N. 4); the two others were probably introduced from the dialect of the copyist who found the double vowels in his original, but neglected doubling where he followed his own way. The same reason explains *do* 16, 16 and 35, 10, beside the regular *duo* (thirty-five examples). In *uiis* (29, 30 and 34, 13) and *uuar* (six examples) the doubling seems to have been neglected by the copyist on account of the preceding double *u*, although in *uaan* and even *uaarnissu* the *uu* has not prevented the following *a* from being doubled. At least in the Rh. Fr. Isidor we find the regular forms *uiis* and *uuaar*.<sup>2</sup> The single *hus* 2, 1 along-side of nine cases of *hûs* (including *dinchûs* and *grapehûs*) is of little account, nor will the misspelled forms *doh* (i. e., *dôd*) 28, 22 and 39, 12 be quoted as militating against the rule. The preterite *gabot* or *kabot*, occurring three times, is balanced by *gaboot* 25, 16 and *arboot* 23, 28. But there remain two examples, which occur so frequently that they cannot be explained by negligent copying and for which no special explanation seems to offer itself: *dar* and *so* (with *sos* 35, 10). These exceptions are the more remarkable as also in the Rh. Fr. Isidor these two words are constantly found with a single vowel: *dhar* and *so* (as distinguished, for example, from *saar* and *dôdh*). There is, as far as I can see, only one way out of this difficulty: we shall have

<sup>2</sup> HOLTZMANN prints in his glossary *uuar* and *uaarnissu*, but has in his text the correct forms. This example shows how easily, in these cases, one of the two vowels may in copying be omitted, even in our day.

to admit, that the vowels of *DHAR* and *so* were in the Rhine Frankish dialect short. This result is confirmed by etymology: *dhar* is Goth. *þar* and *so* is Goth. *sva*. I do not intend to enter here into the question how far *dar* and *so* with short vowels were found in O.-H.G. outside of the Rhine Frankish dialect. But, for several reasons, it seems probable to me that we shall have to allow the forms *dar* and *so* in addition to *dâr* and *sô* for O.-H.G. in general.<sup>3</sup>

There are several misleading misprints (beside those corrected on p. xxv): in the text of frg. 29, 1, *meitar* for *meistar*; p. 126 in the dat. of the paradigm of the *ô*-declension, *-a* for *-u*; in the glossary, p. 168, *grapehus* for *grapehûs*, and, p. 172, *hus* for *hûs*; p. 191, *rihhi* for *rihhi*; p. 198, *stât* for *stat*; p. 200, *suuigên* for *suuigên*, and *suuihhan* for *suuithhan*; p. 201, *tod* and *tot* for *tôd* and *tôt*; p. 205, *uaê* for *unê*.

I do not hesitate to call Dr. HENCH's book the best work in the field of Old-High German that has hitherto been accomplished in this country. It does credit to its author as well as to the Johns Hopkins University, where he has received his philological training, and makes us look forward to his future work with confidence.

HERMANN COLLITZ.

Bryn Mawr College.

### ENGLISH LITERATURE.

*English Writers: An Attempt towards a History of English Literature.* By HENRY MORLEY, LL.D. Vol. vi. From CHAUCER to CAXTON. London: Cassell & Co., 1890. 8vo, pp. 370.

PROFESSOR MORLEY's sixth volume embraces the literature of the fifteenth century, commonly called "the barren period," but it was not so "barren" as it is usually considered, and, by reason of the invention of printing, it gave an impulse to that remarkable development of literature which was seen in the following century. Moreover, it was, in the opinion

<sup>3</sup> The form *so* with short vowel is generally admitted for the compound *solih*=Goth. *svaleiks*.—O.-H.G. *dâr* seems to fit in very well with SIEVERS' statement in his (or PAUL and BRAUNE'S) *Beitr. ge.*, Vol. 16, p. 246, that *þar* and *hwar* existed in West-Germanic alongside of *þâr* and *hwâr*.

of Professor EARLE ('English Prose,' pp. 404 ff.), the period of the second culmination of English prose, "a great era of prose," so that it cannot be skipped over as is sometimes done in the ordinary manuals.

Before treating the literature of the fifteenth century, Professor MORLEY glances at Scotland, and gives quite a full synopsis, nearly thirty pages, of "The Bruce" of JOHN BARBOUR, the contemporary of CHAUCER. He agrees with Professor SKEAT, who has edited "The Bruce" for the Early English Text Society, that BARBOUR did not write the saints' legends attributed to him, as was first suggested by the late Mr. HENRY BRADSHAW,—a suggestion endorsed by Dr. CARL HORSTMANN, who edited the legends for the first time,—nor did he write the fragments of a poem on the Trojan war.

A brief notice of JOHN of FORDOUN's Latin 'Scotichronicon,' continued by WALTER BOWER, and a fuller one of ANDREW of WYNTOUN's "Oryginal Chronykil of Scotland," in English verse, are followed by a chapter on the "Romances" of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, which are too numerous to recount. A specimen one is "Ipomedon," edited by KÖLBING in three English versions (1889), for a notice of which see *American Journal of Philology*, x, 348. "Richard the Redeless" and "The Plowman's Creed and Tale" are noticed in a short chapter. The text is quoted more exactly than heretofore, for Professor MORLEY has shown a disposition to modernize LANGLAND's text, but I must still take exception to "ne reson's bookis" (p. 90), for it is open to the misconception that the apostrophe (') was used with the genitive in the fourteenth century. Also, the citing of "First English" poems, both here and elsewhere in the volume, needs attention, as (p. 95) both *weran* and *waëran* should be *werian*. LYDGATE and OCCLEVE receive due attention, but here again we meet with "Knighté's" (p. 118), "somere's" (p. 124), and *stigan* (p. 131). PURVEY and the controversy with the Lollards follow, with an account of the martyrdom of Sir JOHN OLDCASTLE, "the good Lord Cobham," and the activity of THOMAS NETTER, of Walden, "Inquisitor-General in England for the punishing of heretics," whose chief service to literature is the preservation of

"Bundles of Master John Wyclif's Tares with Wheat," i. e., the *Fasciculi Zizaniorum*, edited by the late Canon SHIRLEY for the Rolls Series. This chapter contains also a notice of the chroniclers of English history, beginning with CAPGRAVE and closing with HARDING. Here we meet with some of those critical remarks that Professor MORLEY scatters all too seldom through his interesting volumes, for example (p. 152):

"Through the fourteenth century, the stream of English literature flowed, broadening and deepening as culture broadened, and the nation passed into new depths of thought, but now the flow is over shoals of barren sands and wastes of marsh haunted by will-o'-the-wisps, with only here and there a runlet of clear water. What harvest of high thought could clothe the desolation of those selfish wars? What serviceable light could shine from the delusive victories of that fifteenth century which bred for us not a single writer of the foremost rank?"

Nearly the whole of English literature in the fifteenth century was imitative. It transmitted formulas of a preceding time. It was distinctly English, too; the character remained, although it was expressed less forcibly. There is advance, too, to be noted, apart from the fact that in the middle of this century stands an event of such great ultimate influence as the discovery of printing."

Among a dozen minor poets whose names are scarce worth mention, JAMES I. of Scotland stands out conspicuous from his "King's Quair," which, although written under the influence of CHAUCER, is the most considerable poem in English literature during the first half of the fifteenth century. A synopsis of it is given, filling some half-dozen pages, after Professor SKEAT's edition for the Scottish Text Society. Professor MORLEY rather inclines to the view that JAMES I. wrote also "Peebles to the Play," and that "Christ's Kirk on the Green" is an imitation of it, one among others that have been lost, "unless, as Professor SKEAT believes, 'Peebles to the Play' itself is one of them, and it is the original by King JAMES which has disappeared" (p. 177). The three stanzas of "Good Counsel," after CHAUCER's "Fle fro the Prees," or "Truth," which Professor SKEAT accepts as written by King JAMES, are given, each stanza closing with the refrain,

"And for ilk inch he wil thee quyt a span,"

This poem shows genuine poetic feeling, and we may well believe that King JAMES was the author of it, for we know of no one else of this time who was equal to its composition.

We now reach the most important name of the middle of this century, that of Bishop REGINALD PECOCK, known chiefly from his "Repressor of Overmuch Blaming of the Clergy," edited by Mr. BABINGTON for the Rolls Series. Professor MORLEY gives a synopsis of this work, which shows that PECOCK was in advance of his age, was too free in the expression of his opinions to suit his ecclesiastical superiors, and hence was forced to recant or be burnt. He did not relish martyrdom, and so his books were burnt instead of himself, and he lived in virtual imprisonment in Thorney Abbey until his death about 1460. Mr. BABINGTON pronounces "The Repressor" to be "a masterly performance," saying that "fullness of language, pliancy of expression, argumentative sagacity, extensive learning, and critical skill distinguish almost every chapter." PECOCK wrote about thirty works all together, thirteen in English, ten in Latin, and seven, of which the titles alone remain. His editor thinks that he "would have been remarkable in any age and was in his own age most remarkable. He was the enlightened advocate of toleration in times peculiarly intolerant; he was the acute propounder of a rational piety against unreasoning and most unreasonable opponents." His work is a landmark of English prose: it is much more easily read than the works of WYCLIF, and he used English to a greater extent than WYCLIF for theological discussions; in fact, this was one of the charges brought against him that "he had written on profound subjects in the English language"; but he lived too soon for his own good.

After some account of Sir JOHN FORTESCUE, with PECOCK a champion of civil and religious liberty, and a synopsis of his great work, "*De Laudibus Legum Angliæ*," we have a summary of dictionaries and translations, legends and fables, songs and ballads, from the 'Promptorium Parvulorum' and the 'Catholicon Anglicum' to the "Nutbrown Maid" and "Chevy Chase." The following chapter treats HUCHOWNE, Blind HARRY and ROBERT HENRYSON. WYNTOUN has left us the name of the first, and has attributed to him the "Geste of Arthur and the Awntyre of Gawane," i. e., the

"Morte Arthure" of the early fifteenth century, and the "Pystyll of Swete Swsane," but histories of literature usually ignore him altogether. Professor MORLEY thinks that no other works are to be attributed to him, although others would assign to him "The Destruction of Troy" and "Sir Gawayne," with its companion poems "The Pearl," "Cleanness," and "Patience." He would identify HUCHOWNE with Sir HUGH of Eglinton, who died about 1381, hence he preceded by some years Blind HARRY and HENRYSON, who are sufficiently well-known, and the latter of whom was no mean poet. Here again we find an oversight (p. 255). While *leman* is *leve-man*, *leve-man* is not "First English," but is a much later form.

A short chapter is devoted to "The Paston Letters," after which follows quite a full account of "The Invention of Printing," and the respective services of COSTER, GUTENBERG, FAUST, and SCHOEFFER. Notwithstanding the claim made for COSTER on a portrait of him, inserted in the *Speculum Salutis*, as "first inventor of the typographic art, about the year 1440," Professor MORLEY finds that "there is no mention of COSTER as a printer earlier than the year 1550," and he calls GUTENBERG, "the real inventor of the art of printing." The whole chapter is an interesting account of this great invention, which gave such an impulse to literature. The volume closes with a chapter on the life and services, to printing and to English literature, of WILLIAM CAXTON. 'The Game and Playe of the Chesse,' a moral treatise, translated from the French 'Le Jeu des Echecs Moralisé,' was undoubtedly printed on the Continent, at Bruges, although some of our histories of literature still call it the first book printed by CAXTON in England. This was, as ascertained some years ago, 'The Dictes and Sayings of the Philosophers,' also a translation from the French 'Les Dits moraux des Philosophes,' made by ANTHONY WOODVILLE, brother to EDWARD the Fourth's queen, ELIZABETH. This book was printed at Westminster, and was completed November the 18th, 1477. It "was the first book of Caxton's that gives printer's name, with place and date of publication."

Professor MORLEY names the several works printed by CAXTON, and gives altogether a fuller account of him and his works than is contained in any other history of English

literature. An appendix to the volume gives a Bibliography of the Miracle Plays, OCCAM, GOWER, CHAUCER, LANGLAND, WYCLIF, and the Romances. While he mentions Professor CORSON's separate edition of "The Legende of Goode Women" (1864), which has been long out of print and ought to be reprinted, he omits Professor LOUNSBURY's edition of "The Parliament of Foules" (1877), the only separate edition mentioned being that by WYNKYN DE WORDE (1530).

The "Last Leaves" repeat that fourteen volumes more will complete the story of English literature as now planned. The author speaks very modestly of himself as "still stumbling as a child, with grown sense of a vast unknown, and of imperfect knowledge of the very ground we tread." He says:

"Years ago a young student came to me at the beginning of a college session and said: 'I don't know whether I need study English Literature. I know about Pope, Chaucer, Dryden, and all that. What is there more?'"

Such students have not all died off, but it is to be hoped that they are getting fewer. May life and strength be spared to Professor MORLEY to complete his great undertaking!

JAMES M. GARNETT.

University of Virginia.

#### SIDNEY'S APOLOGY FOR POETRY.

*An Apologie for Poetrie* by Sir PHILIP SIDNEY, Edited for the Syndics of the University Press (from the text of 1595) with notes, illustrations, and glossary, by EVELYN S. SHUCKBURGH, M. A., Librarian and late Fellow of Emmanuel College, Cambridge. 1891. [Pitt Press Series].

THREE editions of SIDNEY's 'Defence of Poesy' in three different countries within three years are a remarkable testimony to the inexhaustible interest that Elizabethan literature possesses for students in both continents. Mr. SHUCKBURGH's, the latest of the three, is a very pretty little book, printed on excellent paper in the best style of the Cambridge University Press. That the editor "did not know of FLÜGEL's edition (1889) in time to use it" (Preface, p. vi) and that he appears also to

have overlooked that of Professor COOK (1890), may be regarded as fresh testimony to the need of a clearing-house for scholars.

Mr. SHUCKBURGH's text preserves the old spelling; his introduction is sensible and adds some new dates to the usual account of the SIDNEY family; and his notes, which are very full, contain much that is interesting and valuable. The merits of the book are obvious and are sure to make it widely useful. The present notice, however, will concern itself chiefly with faults, not in a spirit of carping, but in obedience to the sound principle enunciated by Professor WRIGHT in his recent review of the same editor's *Æschines* (*Classical Review*, v, 153).

Page 67. *Pedanteria* is not well glossed by "superficial" or 'school' learning."

P. 68. "A piece of a logician" does not mean "a considerable logician," but, as Professor COOK correctly explains it, "a bit of a logician." Mr. SHUCKBURGH has confused this use of *piece* with another of its Elizabethan uses,—“to indicate anything [or person] eminent or special” (as in “a piece of virtue”).

P. 68. "*sith*, 'since,' from A.-S. *sīð* = 'a time.' WYCLIFFE, St. Luke 17. 4, 'and if sevene *sithis* in the dai he do sinne,'" etc. An amazing bit of etymology,—but Mr. SHUCKBURGH's Anglo-Saxon needs revising throughout the notes.

P. 68 (note to p. 2, l. 16). Here the editor has missed the meaning. "It is not clear," he remarks, "whether there is any definite reference to any one as [SIDNEY's] 'master' in poetry." On the contrary, it is clear enough that SIDNEY is referring to Pugliano, his 'master' in manège. "Pugliano praised what he professed (horsemanship): I praise what I profess (poetry). If in this I am carried away by my enthusiasm rather than ruled by my reason, I should be excused, for I am only following Pugliano's example, whose pupil I was."

P. 69. "The mediæval Latin proverb, which Chapman expressed so neatly, 'The greatest clerks are not the wisest men,' 'Cæsar and Pompey,' Act ii, Sc. 1." The reference to CHAPMAN's use of this proverb is welcome; but surely he should not have farther credit than attaches to the power of appreciating a